

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The four attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1-8. These replacement sheets, which include Figs. 1-8, replace the original sheets including Figs. 1-8.

Attachment: Four Replacement Drawing Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By this Amendment, Figs. 1-8 and claims 1 and 14 are amended. Claims 1-3 and 5-21 are pending.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The amendment of claim 1 finds support in Figs. 1 and 2, wherein clamping device 40 is compressed in Fig. 2, but does not contact microsystem 20.

Drawing Objections

The objection to the cross-hatching and the depiction of liquid line 10 is obviated by the drawing corrections to Figs. 1 and 2 made by this Amendment. In particular, cross-hatching representative of plastics is added to bushing 32. In addition, cross-hatching is added to fluidic system 20 to more clearly distinguish it from liquid line 10.

The objection to the lack of certain leader lines is obviated by the addition of more leader lines to Figs. 1-8.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the drawing objections are respectfully requested.

Specification Objection

Appropriate headings were added to the specification by the September 24, 2004 Preliminary Amendment, which appears to have been overlooked by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the specification objection are respectfully requested.

Indefiniteness Rejection

The rejection of claims 5, 8-12, 14-16 and 18-20 as being indefinite appears to be based on an improper renumbering of the claims by the PTO. Although claim 4 was canceled by the September 24, 2004 Preliminary Amendment, claims 5-21 were not renumbered by Applicants and should not have been renumbered by the PTO. See, e.g., MPEP 608.01(j) ("When claims are canceled the remaining claims must not be renumbered.").

A review of the electronic file history on PAIR reveals that a set of claims dated September 24, 2005 include handwriting that renumbered the claims with the notation Rule 1.26. These amendments were not submitted or authorized by Applicants. Moreover, PCT Rule 26

does not apply to these preliminary amendments made in the national phase.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection are respectfully requested.

Anticipation Rejection over Schick

Claims 1-12 (presumably claims 1-3 and 5-13) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,267,143 (Schick). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The ferrules of Schick lack a projection forming the first sealing surface and an engagement surface for the clamping device. The apparatus of Schick does not anticipate the invention of base claim 1 because the apparatus lacks at least one bushing having a projection forming the first sealing surface and an engagement surface for the clamping device.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection over Schick are respectfully requested.

Anticipation Rejection over Ghosh et al.

Claims 13-16 (presumably claims 14-17) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,961,932 (Ghosh et al.). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 14 is directed to a “fluidic system comprising a chip body, to which at least one liquid line is connected by a coupling device according to Claim 1.” Regardless of whether the Examiner is correct that Ghosh et al. discloses a fluidic system comprising a chip body, Ghosh et al. does not disclose or suggest a coupling device according to claim 1.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection over Ghosh et al. are respectfully requested.

Anticipation Rejection over Fuller

Claims 17 and 19 (presumably claims 18 and 20) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,812,959 (Fuller). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 18 is directed to a method for liquid-tight coupling of at least one liquid line to a fluidic system using a coupling device according to Claim 1. Unlike flange 6 of Fuller, the clamping device of the coupling device of claim 1 does not touch the external surface of the

fluidic system. Thus, Fuller does not identically disclose all the features of claim 18 and dependent claim 20.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection over Fuller are respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejections

Claim 18 (presumably claim 19) stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Fuller. Claim 20 (presumably claim 21) stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Fuller in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,077,015 (Leibmann). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Regardless of whether or not the additional features of claims 19 and 21 are obvious modifications to the teachings of Fuller, the proposed modifications do not remedy the failure of Fuller to teach a clamping device that does not touch the external surface of the fluidic system.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections are respectfully requested.

For at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CAESAR, RIVISE, BERNSTEIN,
COHEN & POKOTILOW, LTD.

By 

David M Tener
Registration No. 37,054
Customer No. 03000
(215) 567-2010
Attorneys for Applicants

October 31, 2007

Please charge or credit our
Account No. 03-0075 as necessary
to effect entry and/or ensure
consideration of this submission.